DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 964 SO 012 508

AUTHOR	Anderson, James M.
TITLE	The Evolution and Probable Future of Ethnic Heritage Studies.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Ethnic Heritage Studies Center, Detroit.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Ethnic Heritage Studies Branch.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 79
NOTE	22p.: For related documents, see ED 117 234, SO 012 506 514. Paper prepared for the Conference of the Inter-Collegiate Academic Council on Ethnic Studies (Cleveland, OH, November 30, 1979).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; Blacks; Educational Benefits; *Educational History; Ethnic Groups; Ethnicity; *Ethnic Studies; *Federal Legislation; Minority Groups; Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*Ethnic Heritage Studies Program Act

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the educational history of the Title IX Ethnic Heritage Studies Program. The paper is based on the author's doctoral dissertation from the University of Michigan, 1978, entitled "Government Support to Ethnicity." The first part of the paper places the development of the ethnic studies program in historical perspective. Historically, the concepts of race, nationality and ethnicity have neither been clearly defined nor equitably treated in U.S. government policy. Slavery was tolerated for almost 100 years, and prior to 1871, American Indian tribes were legally viewed as conquered nations to whom the government owned protection under its signed treaties. Prior to 1968, the federal government had no special programs or policies for children who lacked English language proficiency. The second part of the paper discusses the legislation that created the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program which is the result of a long process of national and local organization, private financing, and a shift in public consciousness. The movement to create a federal program for ethnicity has its roots in the black consciousness and social revolutions of the 1960's. The ethnic studies program became official on June 23, 1972 when the bill was signed by President Nixon. However, no funds were appropriated until 1974. The accomplishments of the Title IX program from 1974 to the present are many. It has initiated over 300 ethnic activities and programs in almost every state, has been responsible for the creation of new curriculum materials about most of the ethnic groups in America, and has resulted in hundreds of new resources being disseminated to tens of thousands of students at all grade levels and to community persons. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James M. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED184964

The Evolution and Probable Future of Ethnic Heritage Studies

A paper prepared for the conference of the Inter-Collegiate Academic Council on Ethnic Studies at John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, November 30, 1979.*

by:

James M. Anderson, Ph.D.
Director
The University of Michigan
Ethnic Heritage Studies Program

SP 012 508

Will Rogers once said that its not ignorance that's so bad, its all the things we know "that ain't so." Much of what the schools "know" about ethnic and racial groups has been based on myths, half truths, and erroneous information. Popular examples of such information distortions include Columbus' "discovery" of America, the "sociological theory" of America as a melting pot, and the image of a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (W.A.S.P.) majority. In reality, Columbus was lost - he thought he was in India - and he was the one who was discovered by native North Americans; the melting pot was the title of a 1909 play popularized by the media and used in many textbooks but never endorsed as a valid sociological theory; and according to Census Bureau statistics Anglo-Saxons comprise only 14% of our population.[1.] Much of our society and especially our schools continue to perpetuate these myths. Although the negative consequences of this kind of misinformation has long been known to ethnic leaders, it is only in recent years that government policy makers began to realize the psychological and social consequences of perpetuating a distorted image of American reality.

The Title IX Ethnic Heritage Studies Program marks the first Federal program in U.S. history that actively supported a concept of cultural pluralism and provided support for ethnic activities that were not limited to compensatory education or the solution of "special problems." It allows ethnic groups themselves to correct and supplement their own histories and schools to revamp curricula and retrain teachers.

Relative to other Federal programs, Title IX has a very small authorization ($15 million/year), has received insignificant appropriations (from less than $2 million to a maximum of $3 million per year - or about 1/10 of a cent per year per ethnic American), and the program has never been supported by the Administration.

The most important fact about The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program is that it exists at all. In order to achieve an understanding of the significance of this Program it is necessary to place its development into a proper historical perspective.

The United States does not have a proud history in relation to the concepts of race and ethnicity. Those who did not, or could or would not, fit the W.A.S.P. mold were looked upon as being inferior and were systematically denied human rights in both policy and practice. The tradition was consistently oppressive and discriminatory, but it took different forms for blacks, natives, and immigrants.

The fact that slavery was tolerated for almost 100 years after the founding of "the land of the free" is ironic and shameful. Political and intellectual compromise allowed economic interests to take precedence over human rights. The Compromise of 1850 dodged the issue of slavery. The Dred Scott Decision by the Supreme Court in 1857 was a notorious example that both avoided a federal stand on slavery and legally defined slaves as "property" without any of the rights of citizens.

Prior to 1871, Indian tribes were legally viewed as conquered nations to whom the government owed protection under its signed treaties. In 1871, Congress unilaterally ended its recognition of Indian tribes as separate nations. Although prior treaties were not nullified, the government holds legal title to all land on reservations and the status

of Native Americans has been in a quandary of conflicting policy ever since. Although all Indians were granted full citizenship rights in 1924, there are numerous policies that continue the treatment of at least reservation Indians as wards of the government. Early policy was based on military might and low regard for the rights of Indians. Forced treaty signings, broken treaties, forced removal from Indian lands without compensation, and even genocide were all aspects of nineteenth century policies towards or treatment of Indians.

The immigrant has faced a similar series of oppressive government policies. The concept of race has had an interesting history in respect to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. According to a 1949 article in Social Research by Hans Zeisel,[2] records on each immigrant's race, religion, country of birth, last country of residence, and citizenship were kept since 1898. The then Commissioner of the Immigration Service issued a check list of fifty different "races" ranging Alphabetically from African to West Indian. The list was apparently aimed at standardization rather than scientific or ethnographic accuracy. It was a curious collection of ethnic groups, regionally defined populations, and nationalities. The title was eventually changed to "Race or People," but the list continued in use virtually unchanged until 1937 when the Mexicans were dropped, and in 1943 when Hebrews were removed. Since 1943, Jews and Mexicans, who at times have constituted as much as 25% of our immigration, have not been included in the U.S. immigration statistics! The existence of the list itself indicates the type of conceptual fallacies involving race, nationality, and ethnicity that have been part of our government's policy history at all levels.

Other examples of immigration policies that were blatantly racist include the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1883 and the Quota Act of 1924. In the Quota Act, the Slav was officially assigned the category of "inferior nations and races."[3]

The purpose of these examples has been to illustrate the fact that, historically, the concepts of race, nationality, and ethnicity have neither been clearly defined nor equitably treated in government policy. It is these negative aspects of our history that underlines the significance of Ethnic Heritage Studies. Bilingual-Bicultural Education is also significant in this regard.

In terms of Black Studies, there is no federal Black Studies Program or legislation per se; however, portions of other federal programs are sometimes used to develop special courses or programs. Black Studies programs and courses are widespread. A 1972 survey by the Chronicle of Higher Education[4] indicated that over 200 institutions offered complete programs in Black Studies and 400 more offered specific courses. Various surveys have also shown that from 50 to 75% of those who take courses in Black Studies are white.

Federal education programs related to blacks lack a unifying direction of goal. The policy, if one exists, seems to be to apply massive funding at many levels and hope for the best. The types of programs that do exist, however, could probably all be categorized under one of the three following purposes: (1) to equalize the opportunity to get into the educational process, (2) to compensate for previous economic or educational

shortcomings, and (') to prevent segregation.

If this speculation is accurate, then it is a case of treating symptoms while letting the desease go unchecked. As more and more new programs are created to solve old problems, the policy makers become increasingly distant from the problem itself, and the larger the problem grows. Constant changes in legislation, court mandates, and bureaucratic policy make a clear analysis of the effectiveness of any one program almost impossible. It is an endless cycle that gets worse as it grows.

The Supreme Court, in the 1974 Lau v Nichols Dicision, ruled that schools must do "something special" for students with language handicaps. The Court did not deal at all with bilingual education although the administrative interpretation has been to impose it as the only remedy for violations under the Lau decision.

Prior to 1968 the federal government had virtually no special programs or policies for children who lacked English language proficiency. Today, it spends close to $130 million annually on thirteen separate programs with H.E.W. The programs range from Title VII E.S.E.A., to Project Headstart, to Research at N.I.E., to $1.6 million allocated for adult education. Roughly one half of the total bilingual education budget is for Title VII. In spite of this massive effort, in 1974 this program only serviced 129,000 students out of 7.7 million who it estimated were in need of its services.

The program currently is funding 425 projects in 32 states. The projects involve 68 languages and dialects alghough 80% of the projects

are for Spanish-speaking. In spite of this, only 2.7% of Mexican-American students in the Southwest are enrolled in bilingual education Classes.[5]

The legislation that created the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program is the result of a long process of national and local organization, private financing, and a shift in public consciouness.

The movement to create a federal program for ethnicity has its roots in the black consciousness and social revolutions of the 1960's. Increased black pride and black power kindled sparks of both pride and fear in many white ethnics. A renewed awareness in cultural heritage began to grow as did fears of the apparent strength of the black movement. Although many white ethnic leaders supported the black movement in principle. They also resented the public funds that seemed to be spent so freely as a result of black demands. The resentment was not so much because blacks were able to tap the federal coffers, but because, up to this point, white ethnic groups had not. Many white ethnic leaders felt that they were being ignored by the government. Although this had always been the case, the black movement and rapid social gains of the 60's demonstrated that government apathy did not have to be the case.

The movement in the 60's toward social programs addressing ethnic concerns was not the first such effort in our history. The "intergroup education" and"intercultural education" programs in the 1940's and 1950's were also the result of fear and urban conflict.[6] These early programs

were aimed primarily at easing racial tensions and reducing racial and ethnic prejudices. These programs disappeared almost completely as federal funds were no longer available. The ethnic programs of the 40's and 50's failed because they were problem-centered rather than human-centered. They, in effect, treated the symptoms not the disease.

On January 25, 1971 Richard Schweiker, a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, introduced bill S.23 to the U.S. Senate. Previously, the bill had been introduced in the House as H.R. 15493 by Roman Pucinski, a Demoncratic Representative from Illinois.

The original version of this bipartisan bill would have provided $10 million per year for two years to establish a series of regional Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers. The Senate Education Subcommittee recommended approval of the bill but changed its focus from Centers to Programs. The authorization was raised to $15 million in an appraent compromise move. The amended bill was passed by the full Senate on August 6, 197[illegible]. The House version of the bill was approved in Committee but defeated by the full House by a vote of 200 to 159.

During the period that the bills were pending in Congress, there began a groundswell of multi-ethnic organizations across the country. The organizational activity occured both in support of the concept of the legislation as well as in preparation for anticipated grant competition. Some of this early activity and competition was both racist and divisive, at least in part.

One organization that did emerge during this period was the National Ethnic Studies Assembly, a non-profit, non-partisan group of scholars, educators, and ethnic group leaders organized by Richard Kolm and supported in part by the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs. This group was probably the key to the passage and implementation of the ethnic studies legislation.

Representatives of both N.E.S.A. and other organizations testified before the Congressional committees studying the Ethnic Heritage Studies legislation. Testimony of three kinds was presented. The largest body of testimony consisted of supportive opinions of academics and ethnic leaders. The second variety was negative opinions that expressed fears of increased divisiveness and rekindling the fires of old-world hatreds. The third kind was a number of pleas for grants for specific projects or areas. The Administration was opposed to the legislation and O.E. staff testimony was at best ambivalent. No empirical data were submitted and the only "hard facts" presented were Census figures.

The passage of the bill in the Senate was due primarily to the efforts of Senator Schweiker to push it through and the fact that there was no Senator who was specifically opposed to it. The failure of the bill before the full House was the result of a combination of factors not directly related to the content of the bill.

The House bill was up for vote at the end of a very long marathon session in which a lot of small bills were being decided quickly with

little time for discussion or thought. One Representative who voted against the bill told a colleague and me that the general trust of that session was to disapprove any requests for new appropriations. In an apparent effort to placate us, the Congressman reassured us that he was not opposed to ethnics. The reason he voted against the bill, he said, was because he was out of the room when the bill was introduced. When he returned, he inquired of a fellow Representative as to what vote was being taken. The reply was "it's the polack bill, vote no." And so the Congressman followed his colleague's advice. Apparently his point to us was that he had nothing against ethnics, only "polacks." I did not inform this elected official of my Polish ancestry, but I should have. It is of some consolation that this person failed to win re-election the following year.

This anecdote is included to illustrate both the frivolous factors that can influence important legislation as well as the apparent level of misinformation that existed in the House at the time of the vote.

With the defeat of H.R. 15493 and the passage of S.23, the legislation was referred to a Senate-House Conference Committee for study. Senator Schweiker was a member of that Committee and the compromise bill was essentially the Senate version. This version was approved by the Committee on April 13, 1972 and sent back to the House for reconsideration. The compromise bill passed the House on June 14, 1972. The bill was signed by President Nixon on June 23, 1972 and became Public Law 93-318.

At this point, the passage of this law was only a moral victory. No funds has been appropriated, or would be, for two more years.

The legislation was originally assigned for implementation to the Office of Special Concerns within the U.S.O.E. The function of this unit within O.E. is essentially to deal with "problems." It normally does not administer grant programs. The assignment of the program to this unit was interpreted by some as being a clear indication that the program was not expected to operate. The "problem" was "studied" by this office but no action was taken on the preparation of guidelines or the appointment of a National Advisory Council by the Secretary of H.E.W. Both of these inactions were technically illegal. It was evident at this time that the administration was afraid of this program and did not want to operate it.

Prior to the election in November 1972, President Nixon met with a group of prominent Republican ethnic leaders and promised prompt action in implementing the legislation and supporting ethnicity. No administrative action on this legislation was to occur until almost a year after this meeting. On October 9, 1973 O.M.B. requested that no funds be appropriated for ethnic studies. Many ethnic leaders voiced the opinion that this move represented a broken promise by the President. Attempts to have a second White House meeting with ethnic leaders was not successful nor were other channels of communications effective. In retrospect, the Watergate cover-up seemed to affect any attempt to get the attention of the President on any non-critical program.

Also during the first term of the Nixon Administration, it was common practice for the O.M.B. to refuse to administer or implement those programs that were passed and appropriated by Congress but with which the Administration did not agree. This practice was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1973 or this fate would have befallen Title IX. President Nixon never did act to have his Secretary of H.E.W. appoint an advisory council, even after Title IX was funded and operating. This failure to act was a clear and blatant violation of Public Law 93-318.

In spite of the opposition by the Administration, the Senate appropriated $5 million for Title IX in October 1973. The House voted zero appropriations. A compromise committee settled on $2.5 millon and the appropriation was included with all of fiscal year '74 appropriations for D.H.E.W. President Nixon signed the D.H.E.W. appropriations bill on December 20, 1973. After three years of lobbying and organizing, and in spite of opposition from the highest levels, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program was finally a reality.

During the period when ethnic studies was being contested within the government, a separate struggle ensued within the private sector. Activities and organizations that began in 1970 were now in full swing. Ethnic conferences were being held in cities across the country and a number of "Regional Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers" were incorporated using the exact language of the original bill. Evidence of the level of interest in this program and the organizational effort that was underway

can be found in the application statistics for the first year. In spite of the fact that the Guidelines for Application were not announced until April 12, 1974 and that completed proposals had to be received by May 17, 1974, 1,026 proposals were submitted in competition for 40 grants. Over 8,000 requests for application packets were requested and over 12,000 sent out in total (See chart I). This massive interest in a small program in such a short period of time, is unequaled in the history of the U.S. Office of Education.

At the time of its implementation, the program was removed from the office of Special Concerns and sent to the Division of International Education of the Bureau for Continuing and Higher Education. It remained there as a Branch under a succession of six Branch chiefs and acting chiefs until Spring 1979 when it was placed in the Bureau of School Improvement. During this five year period, a number of efforts were started to combine Ethnic Heritage Studies with other programs. Suggestions included consolidation with Bilingual-Bicultural, moving it to the National Endowment for the Humanities, or giving it to the states to administer. Each of efforts would have, in effect, killed the program - which is exactly what the administration wanted from the beginning. Consolidation with the Bilingual program would have drown this program in a program more than ten times its size with an existing powerful bureaucratic structure and national support network. Moving the program to N.E.H. would have shifted the emphasis away from the schools even if appropriations were to be continued - which was not part of the N.E.H. recommendation. This Administration recommendation was made without the consent or knowledge of anyone at the N.E.H. Moving the program to the fifty states would have diluted the available funds to such an extent as to make them virtually ineffective. Grant patterns since 1974

have already resulted in a fairly uniform grant pattern by state, especially if population and ethnic percentages are taken into consideration (See Chart I).

There is some discussion now about eventually returning the program the Bureau of Continuing and Higher Education and combining it with Global Education. This is a suggestion with some merit that is worthy of further consideration for two reasons. The first is that a combined program of the right kind, could increase the efficiency, effectiveness and clout of both programs. The second is that Global Education is a program with similar goals and an appropriation equal to Title IX. Neither program is likely to dominate or compete with the other. On the surface, at least, it appears to be a fortuitous match.

Title IX is in a stronger position today than it has ever been. The authorization has been extended for two more years, the current appropriation is $3 million, and the Administration has promised to support the program and include it in future budget requests. Chart 2 indicates an apparent leveling off of proposal applications as well as an approximate 11% success percentage for those who do apply. Yet with an average grant amount of only about $40,000 it is difficult for individual projects to produce systemic changes or to maintain long-lasting results. There is some emperical evidence, however, to support the conclusion that a number of projects have produced both system-wide and long-term positive results. One change in the administration of Title IX that should increase its selective impact even more is the decision to allow continuation funding for some projects.

In looking back on the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program over its first six years there are a number of key factors to consider. Title IX has accomplished the following:

It has resulted in positive impact on many schools and in a few cases on entire school systems;

Chart I

Title IX Ethnic Heritage Studies Grants by State:

State	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	Tota
Alabama	1	0	1	2	1	1	6
Alaska	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Arizona	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Arkansas	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
California	3	4	3	5	3	6	24
Colorado	1	1	1	3	1	5	12
Connecticut	1	1	2	1	2	3	10
Delaware	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
District of Columbia	2	5	2	1	3	1	14
Florida	1	0	1	0	2	0	4
Georgia	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
Hawaii	1	1	1	0	2	0	5
Idaho	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Illinois	3	1	2	2	2	1	11
Indiana	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Iowa	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Kansas	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Kentucky	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Louisiana	0	1	0	2	1	1	5
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Maryland	0	1	3	2	2	0	8
Massachusetts	3	3	1	2	6	2	17
Michigan	1	1	2	3	3	4	14
Micronesia	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Minnesota	2	1	0	2	2	1	8
Mississippi	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Missouri	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
Montana	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
Nebraska	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Nevada	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
New Hampshire	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
New Jersey	2	2	0	0	1	2	7
New Mexico	1	1	2	2	1	1	8
New York	5	4	7	7	7	5	35
North Carolina	0	2	0	1	1	1	5

Continued - Chart I
Title IX Ethnic Heritage Studies Grants by State:

State

State	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	Tota
North Dakota	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Ohio	1	1	1	3	3	0	9
Oklahoma	0	0	1	2	1	0	4
Oregon	1	1	1	0	1	1	5
Pennsylvania	3	2	2	3	2	2	14
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Rhode Island	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
South Carolina	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
South Dakota	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Tennessee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	1	2	1	0	1	3	8
Utah	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Vermont	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Virginia	1	1	1	3	0	1	7
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Washington	0	1	1	2	1	2	7
West Virginia	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
Wyoming	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
TOTALS *	42	50	50	63	56	50	317

*(Multi-state consortia are counted in every state consorting)

Chart II

Title IX Grant Patterns 1974-1979

F.Y.	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
# of proposals submitted	1,026 (139 submitted after deadline)	552	570	562	511	436
# of grants awarded	38	48	49	64	56	48
Total funds requested (in millions)	$83.15	$25+ (estimate)	$25.5	$24.1	$25+ (estimate)	$25+ (estimate)
Total grants awarded (in millions)	$2.375	$1.8	$1.8	$2.375	$2.3	$2.0
Ratio of awards to applications	1:27	1:12	1:12	1:8	1:9	1:9
% of proposals funded	2.7%	7%	8.7%	11.4%	11.0%	11.0%
Average size of grant	$62,500	$37,500	$36,734	$29,700	$41,071	$41,667
Total appropriation requested by O.M.B.	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0

NOTE: A total of $3,000,000 will be available for grants in 1980/81.

It has brought numerous schools and other institutions into a close working relationship with ethnic leaders through the creation of community advisory committees for each project;

It has initiated over 300 new activities and programs that have included virtually every state and trust territory in the U.S.;

It has been responsible for the creation of new curricular materials about most of the ethnic groups in America and in most cases have done so either by or with the groups involved; and

It has resulted in hundreds of new resources being disseminated to tens of thousands of students at all grade levels and to communities as well.

What Title IX has not done is that:

It has not resulted in divisiveness, inter-group conflict, or the rekindling of old group hatreds as predicted by some early critics;

It has not yet had significant impact on the curricula of our schools;

It has not yet won over the full support and understanding of the Administration; and

It is not yet providing support to ethnic and community-based organizations to the extent hoped for in the original legislation.

In 1977 I conducted an extensive study of Title IX, the results of which are the basis for much of this paper. As a result of that study I made fifteen recommendations for improving the Title IX program. It is heartening to note that eight of recommendations have been implemented. Since 1977 there has been (1) a change in the structure of the Branch and new, agressive leadership is in place; there is a central resource center (2) (the Ethnic Heritage Studies clearinghouse) to assist in (3) the dissemination of project materials; (4) project directors' meetings have been reinstated; (5) more funds have been appropriated, although not to the level recommended; (6) multiple year fundings for some grants is now possible: (7) the grant decision process has been depoliticized to some extent

by the office of Grant Disbursement and Management; and (8) projects now appear to be monitored more closely.

The remaining recommendations are still relevant to Title IX as it exists in 1980. These recommendations would mandate the Program to:

(1) Provide a component that would evaluate and directly disseminate the existing materials produced under this program

(2) Publish a national newsletter or journal to communicate recent advances and problems of specific interest to Title IX projects

(3) Evaluate the current program by an independent contractor

(4) Establish a more flexible time schedule for grants (i.e. 6 month or 18 month projects)

(5) Fund regional centers as proposed in the original legislation

(6) Make dissemination and utilization of all project-created resources and methods mandatory by returning to an emphasis on three-part projects that perform development, dissemination, and training

(7) Provide a referral service upon request (many problems stated in proposals can be solved by existing methods or resources if they were made available)

Title IX has been successful in accomplishing what was expected of it by the administration. It did provide a vehicle for increased consciousness in some areas, many persons were trained, and materials produced. However, what was expected was too little. The program is tentative, superficial, and reactive. It is not reflective or substantive, nor has it resulted in any real change in the structure or process of the Federal system in their relations with ethnic groups.

The real needs of education and society relative to ethnicity go far beyond the scope of one program. What is needed by government is a multi-faceted, comprehensive program that is strong enough to result in institutional and societal change. Such a program would necessarily include many functions: theory, research, evaluation, dissemination, model development, and both single and multi-ethnic projects. However, until the government is ready to approach the problem with this level of commitment and with substantially more resources, the existing program should be continued and improved.

REFERENCES

[1]Thomas Sowell, Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups, Washington, D.C.: (The Urban Institute, 1979).

[2]Hans Zeisel, "The Race Question in American Immigration," Social Research 16 (June 1949): 222-29.

[3]J.S. Roucek, "Image of the Slav in U.S. History and in Immigration Policy," American Journal of Economics 28 (January 1969): 29-48.

[4]John A. Crowl, "Black Studies: The Bitterness and Hostility Lessen, but Criticism Persist," Chronicle of Higher Education 6, 34 (30 May 1972): 6.

[5]Lawrence Wright, "Bilingual Education," Race Relations Reporter, September 1973, p. 15.

[6]James A. Banks, "Ethnicity and Schooling: Implications for Dissemination," a paper presented at the Ethnic Studies Dissemination Conference at Boulder, Colorado, Nov. 12, 1978.

*Note: This paper is based on, and portions taken directly from James M. Anderson, Government Support of Ethnicity, Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1978.